



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/409,922	09/30/1999	RANDALL BAIRD	2705-70	6051
20575 7590 11/01/2007 MARGER JOHNSON & MCCOLLOM, P.C. 210 SW MORRISON STREET, SUITE 400 PORTLAND, OR 97204			EXAMINER NGUYEN, TOAN D	
			ART UNIT 2616	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 11/01/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/409,922

Applicant(s)

BAIRD ET AL.

Examiner

Toan D. Nguyen

Art Unit

2616

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 August 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19, 21-29, 31, 33-66, 68 and 70-74 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 9, 12-14, 21-29, 31, 33-37, 46, 49-51, 64, 68 and 70-74 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 7, 8, 10, 11, 15, 16, 18, 19, 38-45, 47, 48, 52, 53, 55-63, 65 and 66 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 6, 17 and 54 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 30 September 1999 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

3. Claims 1-5, 10-11, 15-16, and 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Allain et al. (US 6,449,259) in view of the applicant's admitted prior art.

For claims 1, 3-5, 10-11, and 18-19, Allain et al. disclose communication controller, comprising the steps of:

terminating a plurality of call signaling connections, each corresponding to one of a plurality of packet-switched calls, at a packet-switched signaling gateway (figure 2,

reference 204), where each call signaling connection is packet-switched (col. 11 lines 25-27); and

communicating, over a number of sessions smaller than the plurality of call signaling connections, the signaling content of the call signaling connections from the signaling gateway (figure 2, reference 204) to a primary media gateway controller (figure 2, reference 202)(col. 11 lines 27-41).

However, Allain et al. do not expressly disclose routing a plurality of packet-switched bearer streams, each corresponding to one of the packet-switched calls, to a media endpoint controlled by the media gateway controller. The applicant's admitted prior art discloses routing a plurality of packet-switched bearer streams, each corresponding to one of the packet-switched calls, to a media endpoint controlled by the media gateway controller (figure 4, reference 36)(page 3, lines 18-21).

The applicant's admitted prior art disclose further comprising the step of interpreting, at the primary media gateway controller, the signaling content (page 3, lines 22-25 as set forth in claim 3); further comprising the step of issuing gateway control commands, from the media gateway controller to the media endpoint, based on the signaling content (page 3, line 25 to page 4 line 2 as set forth in claim 4); wherein the media gateway controller similarly controls multiple media endpoints and similarly communicates with multiple signaling gateways (page 3, lines 22-24 as set forth in claim 5); wherein the media endpoint is a media gateway (page 3, line 18 as set forth in claim 10); and wherein the signaling gateway and the media endpoint co-reside on the same platform (page 3, lines 22-25 as set forth in claim 11).

One skilled in the art would have recognized the routing a plurality of packet-switched bearer streams, and would have applied the applicant's admitted prior art's media gateway controller in Allain et al.'s packet phone gateway. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, to use the applicant's admitted prior art in Allain et al.'s communication controller with the motivation being to manage gateway bank 34 by handling call control signaling (page 3, lines 22-23).

For claim 2, Allain et al. disclose wherein the smaller number of sessions is one session (figure 2, col. 11 lines 32-41).

For claim 15, Allain et al. disclose wherein the native transport protocol utilized for the call-signaling connections comprises TCP (col. 1 line 56).

For claim 16, Allain et al. disclose wherein the native transport protocol utilized for the call-signaling connections comprises UDP (col. 1 line 57).

4. Claims 7-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Allain et al. (US 6,449,259) in view of the applicant's admitted prior art further in view of Dalrymple et al. (US 6,826,272).

For claims 7-8, Allain et al. in view of the applicant's admitted prior art do not expressly disclose wherein the media endpoint is a media proxy. In an analogous art, Dalrymple et al. disclose wherein the media endpoint is a media proxy (figure 1, reference 105, col. 4 lines 22-24). Dalrymple et al. disclose further the step of forwarding one of the packet-switched bearer streams from the media proxy to a media

Art Unit: 2616

gateway also controlled by the media gateway controller (figure 2, references 211, col. 7 lines 17-24 as set forth in claim 8).

One skilled in the art would have recognized the media endpoint is a media proxy, and would have applied Dalrymple et al.'s routing a PSTN call to an H.323 handset in Allain et al.'s packet phone gateway. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, to use Dalrymple et al.'s method and apparatus for integrated multimedia call control in Allain et al.'s communication controller with the motivation being to perform a routing from an incoming network PSTN call, through the gateway to the user's H.323 handset (col. 6 lines 25-27).

5. Claims 38-43, 47-48, 52-53, and 55-56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Allain et al. (US 6,449,259) in view of the applicant's admitted prior art.

For claims 38, 40-43, 47-48, and 55-56, Allain et al. disclose communication controller, comprising the steps of:

terminating a plurality of call signaling connections, each corresponding to one of a plurality of packet-switched calls, at a packet-switched signaling gateway, where each call signaling connection is packet-switched (col. 11 lines 25-27); and

communicating, over a number of sessions smaller than the plurality of call signaling connections, the signaling content of the call signaling connections from the signaling gateway to a primary media gateway controller (figure 2, reference 202)(col. 11 lines 27-41).

However, Allain et al. do not expressly disclose routing a plurality of packet-switched bearer streams, each corresponding to one of the packet-switched calls, to a media endpoint controlled by the primary media gateway controller; and wherein an H.323 backhaul channel is used when communicating the signal content of the call signaling connections from the signaling gateway to the primary media gateway controller. In the applicant's admitted prior art disclose routing a plurality of packet-switched bearer streams, each corresponding to one of the packet-switched calls, to a media endpoint controlled by the primary media gateway controller (figure 4, page 3, lines 17-21); and wherein an H.323 backhaul channel is used when communicating the signal content of the call signaling connections from the signaling gateway to the primary media gateway controller (page 3, lines 22-24).

The applicant's admitted prior art disclose further comprising the step of interpreting, at the primary media gateway controller, the signaling content (page 3, lines 22-25 as set forth in claim 40); the step of issuing gateway control commands, from the media gateway controller to the media endpoint, based on the signaling content (page 3, line 25 to page 4 line 2 as set forth in claim 41); and wherein the primary media gateway controller similarly controls multiple media endpoints and similarly communicates with multiple signaling gateways (page 3, lines 22-24 as set forth in claims 42 and 43); wherein the media endpoint is a media gateway (page 3, line 18 as set forth in claim 47); and wherein the signaling gateway and the media endpoint co-reside on the same platform (page 3, lines 22-25 as set forth in claim 48).

One skilled in the art would have recognized the routing a plurality of packet-switched bearer streams, and would have applied the applicant's admitted prior art's media gateway controller in Allain et al.'s packet phone gateway. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, to use the applicant's admitted prior art in Allain et al.'s communication controller with the motivation being to manage gateway bank 34 by handling call control signaling (page 3, lines 22-23).

For claim 39, Allain et al. disclose wherein the smaller number of sessions is one session (figure 2, col. 11 lines 32-41).

For claim 52, Allain et al. disclose wherein the native transport protocol utilized for the call-signaling connections comprises TCP (col. 1 line 56).

For claim 53, Allain et al. disclose wherein the native transport protocol utilized for the call-signaling connections comprises UDP (col. 1 line 57).

6. Claims 44-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Allain et al. (US 6,449,259) in view of the applicant's admitted prior art further in view of Dalrymple et al. (US 6,826,272).

For claims 44 and 45, Allain et al. in view of the applicant's admitted prior art do not expressly disclose wherein the media endpoint is a media proxy. In an analogous art, Dalrymple et al. disclose wherein the media endpoint is a media proxy (figure 1, reference 105, col. 4 lines 22-24).

Dalrymple et al. disclose further the step of forwarding one of the packet-switched bearer streams from the media proxy to a media gateway also controlled by



Art Unit: 2616

the media gateway controller (figure 2, references 211, col. 7 lines 17-24 as set forth in claim 45).

One skilled in the art would have recognized the media endpoint is a media proxy, and would have applied Dalrymple et al.'s routing a PSTN call to an H.323 handset in Allain et al.'s packet phone gateway. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, to use Dalrymple et al.'s method and apparatus for integrated multimedia call control in Allain et al.'s communication controller with the motivation being to perform a routing from an incoming network PSTN call, through the gateway to the user's H.323 handset (col. 6 lines 25-27).

7. Claims 57-63, and 65-66 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Allain et al. (US 6,449,259) in view of the applicant's admitted prior art.

For claims 57 and 58, Allain et al. disclose communication controller, comprising the steps of:

means for terminating a plurality of call signaling connections, each corresponding to one of a plurality of packet-switched calls, at a packet-switched signaling gateway, where each call signaling connection is packet-switched (col. 11 lines 25-27); and

means for multiplexing signaling content received over the plurality of call signaling connections onto a smaller number of packet-switched (col. 11 lines 27-41).

However, Allain et al. do not expressly disclose transmission over an H.323 backhaul channel to a media gateway controller. The applicant's admitted prior art discloses transmission over an H.323 backhaul channel to a media gateway controller (page 3, lines 22-24).

The applicant's admitted prior art discloses wherein the packet-switched call signaling connections include H.225 Q.931 connections, H.225 RAS connections, and H.245 connections (page 3, lines 22-25 as set forth in claim 58).

One skilled in the art would have recognized the H.323 backhaul channel, and would have applied the applicant admitted prior art's H.323 backhaul in Allain et al.'s packet phone gateway. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, to use the applicant admitted prior art's H.323 backhaul channel to a media gateway controller in Allain et al.'s communication controller with the motivation being to establish the H.225/H.245 signaling for terminal 20 (page 2, lines 11-20).

For claim 59, Allain et al. disclose wherein the smaller number is one (figure 2, col. 11 lines 32-41).

For claim 60, Allain et al. disclose wherein the transport protocol used by the terminating means for the plurality of packet-switched call signaling connections comprises TCP (col. 1 line 56).

For claim 61, Allain et al. disclose wherein the transport protocol used by the multiplexing means for the single session is selected from the group of protocol consisting of TCP, SCTP, and RUDP (col. 1 line 56).

For claim 62, Allain et al. disclose wherein the transport protocol used by the terminating means for each of the plurality of packet-switched call signaling connections is selected from the group of protocol consisting of TCP, SCTP, and RUDP (col. 1 line 56).

For claim 63, Allain et al. disclose wherein the transport protocol used by the multiplexing means for the single session is selected from the group of protocol consisting of TCP and RUDP (col. 1 line 56).

For claim 65, Allain et al. disclose means for terminating a packet-switched bearer stream associated with one of the packet-switched call signaling connections (col. 11 lines 25-27).

For claim 66, Allain et al. disclose means for receiving gateway control signaling from a media gateway controller; and control means responsive to received gateway control signaling (col. 11 lines 27-41).

***Allowable Subject Matter***

8. Claims 6, 17, and 54 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

9. Claims 9, 12-14, 21-29, 31, 33-37, 46, 49-51, 64, 68 and 70-74 are allowed.

Regarding claim 9, the prior art fails to teach a combination of the steps of: prior to the forwarding step, modifying the format of the forwarded packet-switched bearer stream within the media proxy, in the specific combination as recited in the claim.

Regarding claim 12, the prior art fails to teach a combination of the steps of:

multiplexing, at the primary media gateway controller, outbound signaling content destined for the packet-switched call signaling connections terminated by the signaling gateway, onto the smaller plurality of sessions with the signaling gateway, in the specific combination as recited in the claim.

Regarding claim 27, the prior art fails to teach a combination of the steps of:

means for parsing the multiplexed signaling content into multiple protocol data units and transmitting each protocol data unit over its appropriate packet-switched call signaling connection, in the specific combination as recited in the claim.

Regarding claim 31, the prior art fails to teach a combination of the steps of:

multiplexing means for assembling outbound signaling content- destined for the packet-switched call signaling connections terminated by the signaling gateway- onto a number of sessions smaller than a number of terminated call signaling connections for transmission to the signaling gateway, in the specific combination as recited in the claim.

Regarding claim 37, the prior art fails to teach a combination of the steps of:

a plurality of media endpoints, which comprises both media gateways and media proxies, with each endpoint capable of terminating a plurality of packet switched bearer streams, in the specific combination as recited in the claim.

Regarding claim 46, the prior art fails to teach a combination of the steps of:

prior to the forwarding step, modifying the format of the forwarded packet-switched bearer stream within the media proxy, in the specific combination as recited in the claim.

Regarding claim 49, the prior art fails to teach a combination of the steps of:  
multiplexing, at the primary media gateway controller, outbound signaling content destined for the packet-switched call signaling connections terminated by the signaling gateway, onto a smaller plurality of sessions with the signaling gateway, in the specific combination as recited in the claim.

Regarding claim 64, the prior art fails to teach a combination of the steps of:  
means for parsing the multiplexed signaling content into multiple protocol data units and transmitting each protocol data unit over its appropriate packet-switched call signaling connection, in the specific combination as recited in the claim.

Regarding claim 68, the prior art fails to teach a combination of the steps of:  
multiplexing means for assembling outbound signaling content- destined for the packet-switched call signaling connections terminated by the signaling gateway- onto a number of sessions smaller than a number of terminated call signaling connections for transmission to the signaling gateway, in the specific combination as recited in the claim.

Regarding claim 74, the prior art fails to teach a combination of the steps of:  
a set of one or more primary media gateway controllers, the set of primary media gateway controllers in communication with each of the signaling gateways through H.323 backhaul channels and each of the media endpoints, the primary media gateway controllers using multiplexed signaling content received from the plurality of signaling gateway to control operation of the media endpoints, in the specific combination as recited in the claim.

***Response to Arguments***

10. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-19, 21-29, 31, 33-66, 68, and 70-74 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Toan D. Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-3153. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (7:00AM-4:30PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. Huy Vu can be reached on 571-272-3155. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

TN  
TN



HUY D. VU  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600